

## Feedback from final session at World Heritage: UK Edinburgh 25/26<sup>th</sup> Jan 2016 Day 2

### 1) What are the key learning points from the sessions?

#### **Management Plans and Systems**

- Management plans aren't just printed paper or a website – format isn't the important thing; it's all about systems.
- The real thing is the Management SYSTEM, rather than a Plan.
- Process-led rather than project-led
- There are commonalities of key headings across Management Plans (the Edinburgh matrix was a good example of how to pull these out from others' plans, when preparing your own)
- Avoid the "Cheshire Wedding" we don't have to keep trying to outdo each – size isn't everything! BUT – horses for courses, different WHS's will need different sized plans
- Management comes before the management plan (you're already managing the site; management planning is in part about writing down what you're already doing)
- Management planning should be a dynamic/iterative process rather than a big overhaul every 5 years
- Action Plans in particular evolve and change in the lifetime of the MP
- No "one size fits all" in Management Plans, although there are good things we can share in all of them
- Importance of reality checks – the management plan or system must be deliverable
- Outputs need to go on to Outcomes.
- Management plans can act as a message to funders

#### **Engagement**

- The importance of the engagement *process* with partners and stakeholders
- Keeping people interested in WHS – need commitment from stakeholders
- The importance of having partners and stakeholders who understand both the problems and the benefits/opportunities of World Heritage (this understanding develops through engagement)
- Community engagement should pervade all stages of Management Plan development – build it in from the start, don't bolt it on at the end
- Consultation needs to be focussed

#### **Compliance**

- Common problems but a confusion over what you need to do to comply – what are the key components?
- Different formats are acceptable to UNESCO if the case is made (eg Hadrian's Wall's virtual Plan).
- The guidance out there is getting more all the time – still a challenge to work out what we MUST refer to/what's most useful/what we can park. How to address the need for Plans to change over their lifetime? The environment will change as soon as the Plan is published. Web-based versions allow continuous updating, BUT this needs to be recorded and when does UNESCO need informing – when is a change big enough to warrant a formal notification?

#### **Guidance**

- Guidance on objectives still required – perhaps a general guide to good practice from experiences
- Further guidance is required to take account of what is required but also reflect the factors of the individual site
- UNESCO wants to sustain OUV but there is lots to monitor in terms of attributes
- Attributes are essential and useful
- Diversity – we need a corporate view

#### **Profile**

- The planning system makes its verdict often in ignorance of OUV – there is a major job to do in making world heritage evident and increase its profile
- Differences – can be a barrier rather than an asset

## 2) What are the most important unanswered questions?

### **Management Plans and systems**

- How do we maintain flexibility in our management plans after they've been agreed with stakeholders, partners, DCMS?
- What makes a good management plan?

### **Monitoring**

- What monitoring approaches or systems are needed – realistically, with large areas/numbers of components, and resource pressures – what level do you monitor at?\*
- Monitoring should be based on looking at your attributes – what do you need to monitor to look after OUV? Plus assess what you are monitoring, look more closely where potential for risk or change is greatest. Role volunteers can play in some kinds of monitoring also noted.
- Could periodic reporting help in management planning more?
- Peer Review/support (informal) and produce a table of management plan progress – this workshop was useful

### **Planning**

- National panels or local panels on planning? (questions over local democracy )
- Historic Urban Landscape model – What exactly is it? How useful/relevant is it? How could it be applied to our sites?
- Some management plans might need screening for Strategic Environmental Assessment
- Buffer Zones or not?

### **Profile**

- Why doesn't the Westminster government / Whitehall "get" World Heritage? Because of disparate nature of WHSs? Because the public doesn't either?

### **Resources**

- Where is the money / time resource for management planning going to come from in future given resource pressures?
- Is there consistency of resourcing for the management planning process (writing & revision as opposed to delivery – though that too) across UK WHSs? (And would collecting this information this be a useful bit of project work for a student? – level of resourcing, and what the sources are e.g. LAs, heritage agencies, NT(S), etc.)
- Cost benefit analysis of the Management Plan development process. Are we having to spend too much time developing them, to the detriment of actually delivering the Action Plan?

### **Engagement**

- What are the most effective ways of engaging communities? There may be some principles that can be identified for doing this.

◦

### **Guidance**

- Operation **Guidelines** – are they still fit for purpose?
- The goalposts keep moving, creating uncertainty over issues key to the Management Plan – eg status of Setting/Buffer Zone/Non-Buffer Zone?

### **Monitoring**

- Are we developing/using attributes to best effect?
- what should we be measuring/evaluating/how?
- Are current review periods appropriate/co-ordinated? Is it more realistic to see a continual development/evolution period?

### 3) What do we (collectively or individually) need to do next to help us develop better management systems?

#### **Sharing**

- More of the work we are doing but with more peer support / interaction (like today!)
- Share what works and what doesn't/hasn't – as it happens? Place for a specialist forum?
- Potential to partner up with other sites to share resources/avoid duplication of effort expenditure
- Have an annual workshop of sites in the process of Plan development, meeting with recently successful Plan owners
- Develop peer review of draft plans
- Cross-comparing management plans/systems to avoid reinventing wheel, identify standard components
- Include other WHS's in the consultation process

#### **Guidance**

- Collaborative “must include” (or “must consider”) checklist for management planning
- Produce short guides to ensure decision makers are aware of world heritage issues – may be help with navigation.
- ‘Operational Guidelines For Dummies’ – what does the WHC require, but in plain English & pulled out from the current presentation where it's interwoven with nomination info etc. Basically, seeking to present the spirit vs the word.
- ‘Guidance on the Guidance’ – a resource manual especially for local councillors and planners, decision makers. A one stop shop.
- Produce a common statement on planning legislation relevant to the particular Home Nation – kept updated centrally and available for all Plans to use
- There seems to be a reluctance to identify good practice (averse to promoting a “one model fits all” approach) BUT we could have case studies of successful Systems/Plans and why they are successful.
- What are the key elements we all need? Some guidance/agreed consensus would be great?
- Which way to go? Web-based or traditional?

#### **Training**

- CPD/training
- Training on use (or not) of Buffer Zones/Attributes

#### **Profile**

- Work to improve understanding of World Heritage on part of government /Whitehall & public
- Push good news stories
- 

#### **Research**

- Draw together a list of potential research projects that have relevance across WHSs (to provide evidence base) that we could dip into when approached by students seeking topics
- traditional
- Simple assessment of where you are in the process
- Resources = recent reductions have had an impact
- Balance between the Vision and the monument
- “Do it for UNESCO but do it for yourselves” (it seems European colleagues just do it for UNESCO)

#### **Monitoring**

- Investigate the potential for universities to help in our monitoring and evaluation
- Investigate the possibility of sites sharing monitoring. A collaborative approach/training/toolkit. Leading to a joint body of evidence/ annual WH:UK survey
- See Management Planning as a positive experience

#### **Resources**

- Press UNESCO to recognise that Plans will have to get less elaborate as resources become tighter

**One Key action to focus on:** · Peer review of Plans · Sorting out Buffer Zones & Attributes  
· Developing a common piece on planning legislation